

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/700,241	SINGHATAT, WAMIS
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	James L. Swiger	3733

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James L. Swiger. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Gene Warzecha. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 07 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Upon further review of the previously allowed claims 1, 3-5, and 7-8, claims are still considered to be rejected at least under prior art of record. Claims 1 has only an encircling means and a securing means positively recited in the claim body. Supporting language in the means plus function statements following are considered functional limitations. Included in functional statements are examples such as "being positionalbe," "being releasable engageable," or "being responsive." As stated in the phone conversation, the method claims are now in condition for allowance; applicant agreed to advance prosecution by accepting method claims for allowance and the attached Notice of Allowability is attached herein..